March 14, 2005

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler Senior Attorney Texas Department of Family and Protective Services P.O. Box 149030 Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2005-02146

Dear Mr. Meitler:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 220003.

The Department of Family and Protective Services (the "department") received a request for a copy of the 2004 winning proposal submission by The Bridge Youth and Family Services of Fort Worth ("Bridge") for the STAR RFP for Region 3. You have submitted the requested proposal for our review. Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you claim that the requested information may contain Bridge's proprietary information subject to exception under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the department notified Bridge of the department's receipt of the request and of its right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the submitted information should not be released. See Gov't Code §552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances).

Initially, you acknowledge, and we agree, that the department did not fully comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in seeking this open records decision. Specifically, the department failed to seek a ruling from this office within ten business days of receiving this written request. See Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The department's delay in this matter results in the presumption that the requested information is public. See id. § 552.302; Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins., 797 S.W.2d 379 (Tex. App.—

Austin 1990, no writ). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can generally be overcome when the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. See Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Here, because third-party interests are implicated, we will consider whether any of the requested information must be withheld to protect that third party's interests. Additionally, we note that section 552.136 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the submitted information. Thus, we will also consider the application of section 552.136 as this provision can constitute a compelling reason to withhold information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Bridge has not submitted arguments to this office in response to the section 552.305 notice. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that Bridge's information is excepted from disclosure on the basis of a proprietary interest. See Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

However, Bridge's proposal does contain an insurance policy number made confidential under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. The department must, therefore, withhold the marked insurance policy number under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remainder of Bridge's proposal must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. Id. § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Crawford

Sincerely,

Amanda Crawford

Assistant Attorney General Open Records Division

AEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 220003

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Barbara Clark-Galupi Director of Development All Church Home For Children 1424 Summit Avenue Fort Worth, Texas 76102 (w/o enclosures)

> Mr. Randy Spencer Executive Director The Bridge Youth & Family Services 115 West Broadway Fort Worth, Texas 76104 (w/o enclosures)